## REMARKS

Claims 1-5, 7-17, and 29-32 are pending. Claims 1, 4, 8, 29, and 31 have been amended. No new matter has been added.

### Rejection under 35 USC §112

Claim 1 was rejected under 35 USC §112, second paragraph, for containing language lacking sufficient antecedent basis. Similar language was found in claims 4, 8, 29, and 31, and thus those claims have been amended herein as well. The claims have been amended herein to clarify the antecedent basis for the language "the first time-slot" which previously referred back to "a first of a plurality of time-slots" and now (after amendment) refers to "a first time-slot of a plurality of time-slots". Thus, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection be reconsidered and withdrawn.

### Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claims 1-5, 8-17, and 29-32 have been rejected as being obvious over US Patent No. 4,881,179 to Vincent (Vincent) in view of US Patent No. 6,369,840 to Barnett et al. (Barnett) under 35 USC §103(a). In light of the remarks below, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection.

With respect to amended claim 1, the cited references, individually or in combination, do not teach or suggest a computer implemented method comprising receiving an input for a first time-slot of a plurality of time-slots of a first party's calendar from a second party, the first and second parties being different parties, and the second party being associated with a group affiliation or a user type or both, and the group affiliation or user type or both having a plurality of access privileges for the time-slots of the first party's calendar, wherein the plurality of access privileges are defined for specific time-slots; and processing said received input in

accordance with the access privilege of the second party's associated group affiliation or user type or both for the first time-slot.

Vincent discloses a calendaring system in which various security levels may be defined based on the desired security access for various events. There is no teaching or suggestion of the above discussed time-slot based calendaring method.

In particular, Vincent does not teach or suggest defining access privileges based on specific time-slots as recited in claim 1. Instead, Vincent defines access based on an event security level. Claim 1 specifically recites "wherein the plurality of access privileges are defined for specific time-slots" which is clearly distinguishable from Vincent in which access privileges are defined for specific events.

Claim 1 thus provides a novel method in which the access privileges for one or more parties may be defined specifically based on specific time-slots. In this manner, a user may control access to his/her calendar during the specific time-slots without regard for the particular type of event being read from or written to those time-slots.

For example, using the method of claim 1, a "second party" may be provided access to the time-slot of 9am-5pm Monday through Friday of the "first party's calendar" such that the second party can read and/or write data for that time-slot. In such an example, an event has not been defined as part of the access privilege, instead an access level has been defined which indicates whether or not, and to what extent, the second party can access the first party's calendar and then read and/or write data.

By comparison, Vincent allows a first party to enter an event into his/her calendar and to indicate in that event the security level access for that event. Then,

a second party possessing that level of security access can later view the event. Thus, the access is defined for the event, not for the time-slot. Again, claim 1 is distinguishable by specifying that "the plurality of access privileges are defined for specific time-slots".

Clearly, Vincent uses event-based access privileges and claim 1 defines time-slot based access privileges.

The Office Action cites Column 9, line 53 through Column 10, line 7, for a teaching of access levels. However, the 5 access levels simply define which events an individual may view depending on the defined security level of the event. Thus, in accordance with Vincent, if a first party has entered two events into his/her calendar, one that is Confidential and one that is Unclassified, a second party having a permission level of Unrestricted would only be able to view the second of those two events regardless of the time-slots in which those events occur. That is because the security access of Vincent is event-driven, whereas the security access defined in claim 1 is time-slot based.

The method of claim 1 further allows for the creation of communities connected through the calendar and, in part, based on the defined time-slots. An example of such a community provided in the specification is for students and teachers, in which a student may grant a teacher access privileges only during the school hours. Embodiments of the present invention further provide for duration control and event-specific control, but a defining feature of claim 1 is time-slot based control of access privileges.

Barnett teaches the creation of group calendars in which the members of the group may read/write to the calendar and different levels of access may be provided to each member. However, Barnett does not teach or suggest defining access privileges based on specific time-slots as recited in claim 1. Barnett is cited for

teaching the group calendar creation, but such a teaching merely provides for access to other calendars within a group. The "levels of access" are not further defined, and only teach event-based access, similar to that described in Vincent.

Both Vincent and Barnett thus teach the concept of event-based access to a shared calendar. In these references, as long as the access privilege of the user and the access level of the event match, the user will gain access to the event whenever that event occurs and, thus, the access privileges of the references are clearly event-based.

However, neither reference teaches or suggests time-slot based access privileges. As mentioned above, such a provision, as recited in claim 1, provides a function not taught or suggested by the cited references. Namely, claim 1 allows for an access privilege to be defined for one or more time-slots. Such a system allows for granular control of an individual's calendar and avoids, for example, having events scheduled outside the time-slots the user deems acceptable for particular individuals to schedule events. Meanwhile, claim 1 provides for open access to the specified time-slots to those users granted access (absent further restrictions based on type of events, etc.).

As such, Vincent and Barnett, individually or in combination, do not teach or suggest the features of claim 1 as discussed above. Therefore, when viewed as a whole, claim 1 is patentable over Vincent and Barnett, individually or in combination.

Independent claims 4, 8, 29, and 31 include in substance the same features as described above for claim 1. Thus, for at least the above stated reasons, claims 4, 8, 29, and 31 are not obvious and are patentable over the Office Action's proposed combination of Vincent and Barnett.

Claims 2-3, 5, 9-17, 30, and 32 depend, directly or indirectly, from either claim 1, 4, 8, 29, or 31, incorporating their limitations. Therefore, for at least the same reasons discussed above, claims 2-3, 5, 9-17, 30, and 32 are patentable over the combination of Vincent and Barnett.

In particular, claims 3 and 12 provide for an access privilege having the ability to write data into the first time-slot (see line 3 of claim 3, and line 4 of claim 12). The "write" feature of claims 3 and 12 provides a granular grant of write privileges for a time-slot.

Claims 3 and 12 are rejected over the combination of Vincent and Barnett. The Office Action points to Figures 4A and 5 of Vincent, which, in fact, do not provide such a feature.

Furthermore, the Office Action admits to this failure of Vincent at page 20, lines 19-22, in which it is stated that "Vincent does not explicit teaches the claimed limitation 'wherein the access privileges include an access privilege with an ability of writing an entry into said first time-slot.'" Since Vincent is cited for providing this feature, and the Office Action admits that Vincent does not contain such a teaching, claims 3 and 12 are patentable over the cited combination of Vincent and Barnett.

Claim 7 is rejected as being obvious over Vincent in view of Barnett and further in view of US Patent No. 5,930,801 to Falkenhainer (Falkenhainer) under 35 USC §103(a). In light of the remarks below, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection.

Claim 7 depends from claim 4, incorporating its limitations. Therefore, for at least the same reasons discussed above, claim 7 is patentable over the combination of Vincent and Barnett. Falkenhainer fails to overcome the deficiencies of Vincent

14

and Barnett. Thus, claim 7 is patentable over the combination of Vincent, Barnett, and Falkenhainer.

In particular, Falkenhainer was cited for teaching access privilege with a write function. The cited portion of the reference reads "According to the present invention, individual files within the file system 12 are each associated with what is here called an "object." In the present context, an 'object' associated with a file in file system 12 is a set of metadata, or in other words, a field or string of data, which describes the access properties (read and/or write permissions), hierarchical relations, and other properties of the file." Such a description does not teach providing access privileges that include an ability of writing an entry into a first time-slot and an ability of viewing an entry in the first time-slot, as recited in claim 7. The write access described in Falkenhainer is provided file-by-file and provides no indication of time-slot based access.

Furthermore, the Office Action fails to provide any motivation to combine the cited references. There is merely a conclusory statement that "[i]t would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply Falkenhainer's teaching of access privilege with an ability of writing to Vincent's system in order to prevent [a] non-authority user to modify an owner's calendar without permission." Thus, the Office Action fails to establish a prima facie case of obviousness.

A teaching or suggestion to make the combination recited in the claims must be found in the prior art. In re Vaeck, 947 F.2d 488, 20 USPQ2d 1438 (Fed. Cir. 1991). In fact, none of Vincent, Barnett, or Falkenhainer provide a motivation to combine.

Further, rejections based on 35 USC §103(a) must have a factual basis. In re Warner, 379 F.2d 1011, 1017, 154 USPQ 173, 177-178 (CCPA 1967). In making

15

such a rejection, an examiner has the duty of supplying the requisite factual basis
and may not resort to speculation, unfounded assumptions, or hindsight
reconstruction to supply deficiencies in the factual basis.

The motivation stated in the Office Action is lacking in any factual basis and
merely states a hindsight justification for the present invention being made. A
statement that one would have been motivated to make the combination cited in the
Office Action because such a combination would prevent unauthorized users from
modifying an owner's calendar simply states a purpose of the present invention. At
no point, does the Office Action provide any indication of where one would find such
motivation. In fact, the file-by-file accesses granted in Falkenhainer have little to do
with the time-slot based read and write privileges defined in claim 7. For this
additional reason, claim 7 is patentable over the combination of Vincent, Barnett,
and Falkenhainer.

## Conclusion

Applicant respectfully asserts that claims 1-5, 7-17, and 29-32 are in condition for allowance.  Entry of the foregoing is respectfully requested and a Notice of Allowance is earnestly solicited.  Please charge any shortages and credit any overages to Deposit Account No. 500393.

Respectfully submitted,

SCHWABE, WILLIAMSON & WYATT, P.C.

Dated:  October 26, 2006

Steven J. Prewitt
Reg. No. 45,023

Pacwest Center, Suites 1600-1900
1211 SW Fifth Avenue
Portland, Oregon 97204
Telephone: 503-222-9981